



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Barth had telephoned Attorney Choi regarding the Remarks in the Amendment dated 22 September 2003 which discussed the Specification and Drawings. In particular, the page numbers of some of the elements discussed in the Remarks did not correspond to the pages in the Substitute Specification dated 22 September 2003. Moreover, Examiner Barth wished to discuss whether the additions to the Specification might present any difficulties regarding new matter. For example, Attorney Choi pointed out that although element 46 in Figure 3 had not been previously identified with a numeral in the prior Specification, it was clear from the discussion therein that the "defect detection circuit" discussed therein could only be element 46. After discussing the remaining elements in the Drawings and the Specification, the Examiner concluded that it would be clear that each of the elements had been disclosed in the original Specification, albeit with some minor typographical errors and omissions, thus no new matter had been introduced..